Case 3:15-md-02672-CRB Document 1966 Filed 09/30/16 Page 1 of 3

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JONATHAN COHEN, DC Bar 483454; jcohen2@ftc.gov MICHELLE L. SCHAEFER, DC Bar 478773; mschaefer@ftc.gov SANGJOON "SIMON" HAN, DC Bar 998971; shan@ftc.gov MEGAN A. BARTLEY, VA Bar 81840; mbartley@ftc.gov Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, CC-9528 Washington, DC 20580 (202) 326-2551 (Cohen); -3515 (Schaefer); -2495 (Han); -3424 (Bartley); -3197 (fax) Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9 10 11	IN RE: VOLKSWAGEN "CLEAN DIESEL" MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCT LIABILITY LITIGATION	MDL DOCKET NO. 2672 CRB (JSC) FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND
12 13 14	This document relates to: ALL ACTIONS (except securities actions)	MOTION TO ENTER ITS PROPOSED PARTIAL STIPULATED ORDER FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION AND MONETARY RELIEF
151617		Hearing: October 18, 2016 Time: 8:00 a.m. Courtroom: 6 - 17 th Floor
18	The Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") respectfully requests that the Court enter the	
19	Proposed Partial Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunction and Monetary Relief (DE 1607)	
20	("the FTC Order") along with the other components of the global 2.0L "Clean Diesel"	
21	settlement, including the proposed DOJ Consent Decree and the Class Action Settlement. 1	
22	As the FTC previously explained, the robust consumer relief in the FTC Order fully	
23	compensates consumers because it provides the retail value of their vehicle before Volkswagen's	
24	deception became public, in addition to compensation for other losses. See DE1781, FTC	
25		
2627	¹ Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. has agreed to the proposed FTC Order as well as the proposed DOJ Consent Decree and the proposed Class Action Settlement.	
28	In re Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Marketing, Sales Practices & Products Liability Litigation, MDL No. 2672 FTC MOTION TO ENTER PROPOSED PARTIAL STIPULATED ORDER	

Case 3:15-md-02672-CRB Document 1966 Filed 09/30/16 Page 2 of 3

Statement Supporting the Settlement (Aug. 26, 2016). Given the settlement's importance, the 1 2 FTC respectfully requests that the Court enter the proposed FTC Order along with the related 3 agreements so that complete relief for consumers can begin. 4 5 Dated: September 30, 2016 Respectfully Submitted, 6 Jonathan Cohen (jcohen2@ftc.gov) 7 Michelle L. Schaeffer (mschaefer@ftc.gov) Sangjoon "Simon" Han (shan@ftc.gov) 8 Megan A. Bartley (mbartley@ftc.gov) Federal Trade Commission 9 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, CC-9528 Washington, DC 20580 10 (202) 326-2551 (Cohen); -3515 (Schaefer); -2495 11 (Han); -3424 (Bartley); -3197 (fax) 12 Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 ² Although the FTC supports the private Class Action Settlement, the legal rationale that 22 the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee ("PSC") uses does not necessarily reflect FTC law. See 23 DE1784, Pl.'s Mem. in Support (Aug. 26, 2016). Specifically, the PSC argues that, under private consumer protection law, a "refund remedy" requires that "a plaintiff return the product 24 in comparable condition to what the plaintiff received" and that recoveries be reduced based on "value provided to the Plaintiff." *Id.* at 21 (citations omitted). Neither proposition applies universally under the FTC Act. Rather, the equitable relief available to the FTC under the FTC 25

28

27

26

relief.

Act can vary depending on the circumstances. The differences between the FTC Act and private

law can be critical to the Commission's ability to compensate consumers fairly when it seeks

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jonathan Cohen, hereby certify that on September 30, 2016, I caused to be served true copies of the foregoing by electronic means, by filing such documents through the Court's Electronic Case Filing System.

Jonathan Cohen (jcohen2@ftc.gov) Attorney for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission